

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/780,755	O'ROURKE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristie Shingles	2141	

All Participants:
Status of Application: ALLOWED

 (1) Kristie Shingles, Examiner.

(3) _____.

 (2) Charles S. Fish, Atty.Reg.No. 35,870.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 December 2005
Time: 4:00pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

Pending claims: 1, 3 and 10-14

Prior art documents discussed:

Smith et al (USPN 5,860,082)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 10-14 over the prior art and explained the broadness of claim 14. Applicant explained that the Smith et al reference fails to teach the network address translation scope of Applicant's claimed invention.